APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,208	03/30/2004	Anthony Aue	M61.12-0630	5138

27366   7590   06/30/2008
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244

EXAMINER
GODBOLD, DOUGLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/813,208	AUE ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD	2626	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>07 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

(a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 3-16, and 18-40</u>.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regards to applicant's arguments, see Remarks page 11, that Menezes fails to teach calculating a score for each of the set of transfer mappings that describe a select node of an input semantic structure using a statistical model, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted in the rejection, a subset of transfer mappings are selecting in paragraph 121. In figure 8, 350 shows nodes (or individual words such as direccion to address) that have been mapped. Table 1 shows the metric used, which includes frequencies and scores, which are both forms of statistical analysis. Therefore Menezes teaches calculating a score for each of the set of transfer mappings that describe a select node of an input semantic structure using a statistical model.

With regards to applicant's arguments, see Remarks page 12, that Menezes fails to teach selecting which of the transfer mappings that describe the select node has a highest score, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Paragraph 0126 teaches that it is possible to choose the best one of the subset of mappings based on size or other reasons. This is a way of selecting based on a high score.

With regards to applicant's arguments, see Remarks page 12, that Menezes fails to teach using the selected transfer mapping to construct the output semantic structure, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As described in paragraph 0121, the selected subsets are used to generate the logical structure, and paragraph 0126 shows that it is possible to choose from among the select node with the highest score as described above.

With regards to applicant's arguments, see Remarks page 13, that Menezes fails to teach combining score of the highest scoring mappings that describe the child node with a score of the select node to find the scores of each set of transfer mappings that describe the select node, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As pointed out in the final rejection, paragraph 0092 teachings aligning tentative correspondence. This would be based on the metric described above for aligning nodes, which is based on scoring. Therefore Menezes teaches combining score of the highest scoring mappings that describe the child node with a score of the select node to find the scores of each set of transfer mappings that describe the select node, the examiner respectfully